Application No. 10/799,204 Amendment filed: September 2, 2005 Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2005



REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, and 4-7 under 35 USC 102(b) as unpatentable over Culnane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,672,548). The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Culnane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,672,548) in view of Bunyan et al. (US. 6,054,198). The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Culnane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,672,548) in view of <u>Beck.</u> (US. 5,110,494). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach all of the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention. In particular, the cited references fail to teach the elements of independent claim 1 of "coating a thermally conductive heat spreader body with an organic surface protectant and coupling the heat spreader body directly to a thermal interface material, the thermal interface material in direct contact with an IC die." In contrast, Culnane teaches a heat spreader 165 attached to the back side of chip 150 using a flexible-epoxy 166 as illustrated in Figure 2 of Culnane (Col. 4 lines 34 – 35.) Bunyun teaches a thermal dissipation member 20 without a coating that is coupled to an electronic component 12 by an interlayer 30 (See Figure 1.) Beck fails to teach the elements of coating a heat spreader body with an organic surface protectant and coupling the heat spreader body directly to a thermal interface material, the thermal interface material in direct contact with an IC die. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or render obvious the elements of independent claim 1 and the claims that depend upon and incorporate the elements of claim 1.